

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XVII, Issue No. 8

February 2012

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

10 reasons the U.S. is no longer the land of the free

by Jonathan Turley

Every year, the State Department issues reports on individual rights in other countries. Iran, for example, has been criticized for denying fair public trials and limiting privacy, while Russia has been taken to task for undermining due process. Other countries have been condemned for the use of secret evidence and torture.

Even as we pass judgment on countries we consider unfree, Americans remain confident that any definition of a free nation must include their own — the land of the free. Yet, in the decade since Sept. 11, 2001, this country has comprehensively reduced civil liberties in the name of an expanded security state. The most recent example of this was the National Defense Authorization Act, signed Dec. 31, which allows for the indefinite detention of citizens.

While each new national security power Washington has embraced was controversial when enacted, they are often discussed in isolation. But they don't operate in isolation. They form a mosaic of powers under which our country could be considered, at least in part, authoritarian. Americans often proclaim our nation as a symbol of freedom to the world while dismissing nations such as Cuba and China as categorically unfree. Yet we may be only half right. Those countries do lack basic individual rights such as due process, placing them outside any reasonable definition of "free," but the United States now has much more in common with such regimes than anyone may like to admit.

These countries also have constitutions that purport to guarantee freedoms and rights. But their

governments have broad discretion in denying those rights and few real avenues for challenges by citizens — precisely the problem with the new laws in this country.

The list of powers acquired by the U.S. government since 9/11 puts us in rather troubling company:

1. Assassination of U.S. citizens (in Yemen).
2. Indefinite detention (of alleged terrorists).
3. Arbitrary justice (trial of civilians in military courts).
4. Warrantless searches ("national security letters" demanding information on citizens without probable cause).
5. Secret evidence (used to detain individuals).
6. War crimes (blocking prosecution of agents alleged to have waterboarded persons suspected of terrorism).
7. Secret court (the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which has issued secret warrants permitting secret searches of individuals not part of an identifiable terrorist group).
8. Immunity from judicial review (granting immunity to companies that assist in the warrantless surveillance of citizens).
9. Continual monitoring of citizens (by GPS devices, without court order or judicial review).
10. Extraordinary renditions (the ability to transfer citizens and non-citizens to a foreign country for torture).

These new laws have come with an infusion of money into an expanded security system on the state and federal levels, including more public surveillance cameras, tens of thousands of security personnel and a massive expansion of a terrorist-chasing bureaucracy.

Some politicians say these increased powers are merely a

response to the times we live in. Thus, Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) said without objection that "free speech is a great idea, but we're in a war." Of course, terrorism will never "surrender" and end this particular "war."

Others rationalize that, while such powers may exist, it really comes down to how they are used. This is a common response by liberals who cannot bring themselves to denounce Obama as they did Bush. Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.), for instance, has insisted that Congress is not making any decision on indefinite detention: "That is a decision which we leave where it belongs — in the executive branch."

And in a signing statement with the defense authorization bill, Obama said he does not intend to use the latest power to indefinitely imprison citizens. Yet, he still accepted the power as a sort of regretful autocrat.

An authoritarian nation is defined not just by the use of authoritarian powers, but by the ability to use them. If a president can take away your freedom or your life on his own authority, all rights become little more than a discretionary grant subject to executive will.

The framers lived under autocratic rule and understood this danger better than we do. James Madison famously warned that we needed a system that did not depend on the good intentions or motivations of our rulers: "If men were angels, no government would be necessary."

Benjamin Franklin was more direct. In 1787, a Mrs. Powell confronted Franklin after the signing of the Constitution and asked, "Well, Doctor, what have we got — a republic or a monarchy?" His response was a bit chilling: "A republic, Madam, if you can keep it."

Since 9/11, we have created the very government the framers feared: a government with sweeping and largely unchecked powers resting on the hope that they will be used wisely.

The indefinite-detention provision in the defense authorization bill seemed to many civil libertarians like a betrayal by Obama. While the president had promised to veto the law over that provision, Levin, a sponsor of the bill, disclosed on the Senate floor that it was in fact the White House that approved the removal of any exception for citizens from indefinite detention.

Dishonesty from politicians is nothing new for Americans. The real question is whether we are lying to ourselves when we call this country the land of the free.

Jonathan Turley is the Shapiro professor of public interest law at George Washington University.

-- Washington Post, Jan. 13, 2012

Is the Super Bowl Socialist?

By David Morris

Is the Super Bowl a socialist enterprise? Yes the language is provocative but not, I believe, inappropriate. After all Indiana, the site of the next Super Bowl, is currently governed by those who insist government should play a minimal role and the word they, and their Republican counterparts around the country use to describe those who disagree is socialist.

By any definition, the February 5th Super Bowl in Indianapolis is socialist from head to toe.

Start with the venue. Governments paid for over 80 percent of the new \$750 million Lucas Oil Stadium. The Colts chipped in about 15 percent, an investment they probably recouped in inflated asset value the day the stadium opened. Governments are also covering the estimated \$20 million a year in operating deficits.

-- www.onthecommons.org Jan. 24, 2012

Being ex-president can be lucrative gig

By Brianna Keilar

Being president pays; \$400,000 a year, in fact.

When President Harry Truman left office in 1949 he made \$100,000. In 1969 the salary went up to \$200,000, and in 2001 Congress doubled it again.

When a president leaves the White House he receives an annual pension of about \$200,000, health care,

paid official travel and an office.

In 2010 rent for President Jimmy Carter's Atlanta office was \$102,000 per year. President George H. W. Bush's Houston office costs \$175,000 per year. President Bill Clinton's office in New York City is \$516,000.

Not too bad, huh?

But these taxpayer-funded benefits are nothing compared to the big bucks presidents rake in writing books.

"My Life" netted Bill Clinton a \$15 million advance.

George W. Bush earned \$7 million for the first 1.5 million copies of "Decision Points."

Jimmy Carter has written 14 books.

"He was broke when he came out of the White House," presidential historian James Thurber said. "If you can write or you can write with someone else, you can make a great deal of money. Jimmy Carter did that."

Book sales are still President Obamas' main source of income.

But speeches are the way to go. And Bill Clinton is the reigning king.

Since 2001, he's earned \$75.6 million giving speeches, according to the latest financial disclosure required of his wife, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

The Center for Public Integrity estimates George W. Bush has made \$15 million from speeches since leaving office.

All of that money raises questions.

"I think the American people think American politics is all about money," Thurber said. "And this certainly doesn't change their view."

Not all presidents have gotten rich after leaving office.

Harry Truman couldn't afford to answer the copious mail he received or respond to requests for appearances. This prompted Congress to adopt pensions and benefits for former presidents so they weren't forced into activities deemed unsuitable for a former head of state.

-- CNN January 27, 2012

Violence solves a lot

by Kirby Ferris

One of the more deceptive lines of the socialist-liberal agenda is the banal phrase: "Violence doesn't solve anything." But was Hitler stopped by peace marches, negotiations, or "conflict resolution" sessions? It is a horrible task, but evil acts, whatever shape they take, must be countered by a superior,

violent force.

The liberal doesn't understand that the threat of violence is perhaps the most effective preventative of actual physical conflict. Liberals in modern times mocked the phrase "peace through strength" as though the idea was rooted in some atavistic, macho, testosterone-poisoned psychosis propagated by alpha males.

Can't the liberal understand that bad people are prevented from committing evil acts by fear of punishment? Perhaps in childhood, the threat of adult disapproval or the disapproval of one's schoolyard peers keeps the youngster in some kind of conformity to morality. But the criminally-minded teenager doesn't really care what other people think. Crime pays. Evil is profitable. Bullying works. Unless, that is, you realize that your malicious behavior will be rewarded by a beating, a bullet, or a prison cell.

A peaceful, free society, of which America (even with its flaws) is the most outstanding example in all of history, is preserved by the willingness of its people, either singly or as a group, to commit decisive acts of righteous violence to counter evil activity.

Hebrew scholars agree that the Commandment "Thou shalt not kill" is more accurately translated "Thou shalt not murder." The punishment for murder in ancient Israel was stoning. Stoning was the most effective way to spread responsibility for the execution to the mass of individuals who were willing to pay the price for living in a peaceful, moral society. Because of its face-to-face horror, the compassionate individual would, one might imagine, actually cast the first stone ...to make sure it knocked the murderer immediately unconscious, in much the same way the ethical hunter or fisherman puts his quarry out of its misery as quickly as possible. The ancient Hebrews forced personal responsibility on each individual via the group act of stoning.

It comes down to the individual being willing to act with righteous force when confronted by certain criminal behaviors. How many of you would idly stand by and watch a man torture a helpless pup? You would first yell at him to stop. If he continued, you might throw yourself between him and the bleeding, cringing animal. What if he slaps you aside and continues his barbarity? You look around and see a two-by-four on the ground. How many of you would not

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. – Mark Twain

take that two-by-four to the man with a clear conscience? Sorry, there are no cell phones around. You can't call the cops or the Humane Society. You have to act now! What do you do? Are you really going to stand by and watch the travesty, all the time telling yourself that "violence doesn't solve anything"?

If you would club the animal torturer with a two-by-four, how much quicker should you come to the defense of a human victim? I grew up in the Marxist-Socialist, namby-pamby Bay Area, and I wish I had a nickel for every time I heard some pompous person tell me "I could never kill anyone!" I even said it a few times myself during my naive teens and 20s. It felt so good to utter that unctuous homily. But I don't feel that way anymore.

I would kill another human being. I would do it to save my own life or the life of an innocent victim. The act would probably make me physically ill. I might have to live with it in my mind for the rest of my life, but I pray I would have the courage, yes, courage, to stop consummate evil with whatever means necessary.

And for this reason I am a fervent advocate of the right of the law-abiding and sane individual to possess and carry a firearm. The right to self-defense is not only a right guaranteed by the Constitution, it is a duty, a command of "Nature and Nature's G-d" (to quote Jefferson) that each of us must confront if we are to preserve freedom and moral civilization.

Modern-day "gun control" is not something invented by Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer. Adolph Hitler used firearms registration to create the paper trail that facilitated the confiscation of the firearms of his opponents in Nazi Germany. America's Gun Control Act of 1968 bears such an amazing resemblance to the Nazi law that every school child should be made aware of the similarity. Or perhaps we should all think about a very simple fact: slaves can't own guns.

We might wish that evil men could be persuaded from their vile behavior with bleeding heart entreaties, a kiss on the cheek, or proper toilet training. But it ain't that way, folks, Pacifism is a sickness, an actual moral perversity. You may choose to walk to the cattle car, but damn you if you let your children be led up the ramp. You must never allow any group or government to steal your right to exercise armed lethal force in a just situation.

One of the greatest instructors in the defensive use of firearms used to say to his graduating classes: "May you

never have to use what you have learned here." And in that spirit I would like to see an American citizenry that is armed to the teeth and as skilled in the use of pistols and rifles as we are in the driving of automobiles. Am I insane? Somehow, looking at the tragic lessons of history, I don't think so.

Note: This is a reprint of an article Kirby Ferris authored for the Coastal Post Newspaper of Marin County, CA in 1998; minor updates and edits have been made for JPFO.

-- Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership, 2012

DownsizeDC.org's "One Subject at a Time Act"

AKRON, Ohio, Jan. 31, 2012 --

Thanks are due to Congressman Tom Marino of Pennsylvania, who has introduced our 'One Subject at a Time Act' (OSTA) in Congress.

"OSTA would require each bill Congress passes to be about one subject only," says Jim Babka, President of DownsizeDC.org, Inc. "This would end the practice of clustering unrelated measures into one package. Congressional leaders have long used this trick to pass unpopular laws on the strength of the popular proposals with which they're unnaturally joined. OSTA would end this fraud forever."

Congressman Marino told his constituents that Obamacare was a big motivation for introducing OSTA. "In order to garner enough votes to pass the law, a host of unrelated measures were tacked onto Obamacare," says Marino.

DownsizeDC.org created OSTA in response to numerous omnibus bills. For instance, the massively unpopular Real ID Act was only passed because the Republican leadership included it in an Emergency Troop Appropriation bill. That bill also included tsunami relief!

Babka commends Representative Marino for his leadership and applauds the Williamsport Tea Party for their crucial support. "Now we can begin to collect co-sponsors for this vital reform," Babka concluded.

SOURCE DownsizeDC.org, Inc.

Why You Should Own a Silencer (Suppressor)

By David Morris

Welcome to this week's Urban Survival Newsletter, brought to you by Jeff Anderson's Social Chaos Survival Guide.

Most firearms enthusiasts agree that suppressed firearms are

some of the most fun and most desirable firearms toys you can play with.

In addition to the cool factor that comes with seeing special operations units use them, they have great practical value for preparedness minded people.

To begin with, "silencers" don't silence a weapon...they only suppress the sound level of the firearm, by using the same noise suppression concept as automobile mufflers. Both allow the expansion of gasses inside of a container rather than in the open air.

When you consider that suppressors decrease sound levels, improve accuracy, reduce felt recoil, and reduce muzzle flip, it's evident that they are almost the perfect tool for introducing new shooters to the sport...particularly young shooters and females.

In a survival situation, a suppressor can shorten the radius within which other people could DF (direction find) you based on the report of your shot. Put another way, if people could hear your unsuppressed shot a mile away, that distance might drop down to a quarter mile, decreasing the area where people can hear your shot by 16 times. (A circle with a 1 mile radius covers 3.14 square miles. A circle with a .25 mile radius covers .2 square miles). However, many factors come into play. This example is for illustrative purposes.

Using most normal powder loads, suppressors contain most of the muzzle flash and allow shooters to maintain their night vision longer than with unsuppressed weapons; when using an SBR, (Short Barreled Rifle) suppressors can significantly increase muzzle velocity and terminal ballistics.

So who can own a silencer? If you're a legal U.S. Resident, 21 or older, a non-felon, and live in AL, AR, AK, AZ, CO, CT, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, ME, MI, MS, MO, MT, ND, NE, NV, NH, NM, NC, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI, WV, or WY, you can own a silencer...if you buy it from a firearms dealer who has a "Class III" license and pay a \$200 tax for each suppressor. Right now, the wait is approximately 6 months for the ATF to approve your application.

If you don't live in one of these states, you can STILL buy sub-caliber inserts. I wrote about them about a year and a half ago...I put an excerpt in the P.S. at the end of this article.

Technically, if you buy a silencer in your name, you are the only person who can use it, have access to it, or control of it without committing a felony. That means that if you own a

safe and keep your suppressors in your safe, nobody, including your spouse, can have the combination.

If you're at the range, you can't legally let anyone else fire your suppressed weapon or handle your suppressor.

P.S. Here's an excerpt on what I wrote on the sub-caliber round:

\$15 "Silencer" For Your .308 With NO Tax Stamp!

I got my latest "Sportsman's Guide" catalog this week and they've got a very neat little "tool" that will let you shoot .32 ACP ammo through bolt action .308s (and a few other .30 caliber rifles).

They're called "sub caliber sleeves" or "rifle chamber inserts." I've got a handful of these little treasures and they have a few important uses for preppers.

To begin with, when you shoot a .32 ACP through a .308 barrel, the report is MUCH quieter than with a .308...almost like using a silencer. Next, if you're training someone to shoot a high powered rifle, it's less expensive to shoot .32 ACP than .308 and there's almost no recoil. Also if you shoot small game with a .32 ACP, there will be a lot less meat destroyed than if you make the same shot with a .308.

-- www.secretsofurbansurvival.com Jan. 12, 2012

"Mujahideen are proud to kill in the name of God."

DETROIT (AP) Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab was the same defiant man who four months ago pleaded guilty to all charges related to the attempted destruction of Northwest Airlines Flight 253 with a bomb in his underwear on Christmas 2009. He seemed to relish his mandatory life sentence and defended his actions as rooted in the Muslim holy book, the Quran.

"Mujahideen are proud to kill in the name of God. And that is exactly what God told us to do in the Quran. ... Today is a day of victory," Abdulmutallab said in court.

-- Feb. 16, 2012

Newt and the neocons

By Wayne Barrett

Casino king Sheldon Adelson is bankrolling Republican presidential hopeful Newt Gingrich's far-out positions on virtually every Middle East-related question, from applauding the assassination of Iranian scientists to painting Palestinians as an "invented people" to requiring loyalty oaths from Muslim governmental appointees.

Since his days in the House, Gingrich has always attached himself to the neocon elements of American and Israeli politics. Adelson's \$18 million in contributions since 2006 only further fueled Newt's already chronic case of bombast.

If elected, Gingrich would be the first American president to emerge from the dark think-tank world born in the Reagan era that gave us the Iraq War and lusts now for an Iranian reprise. A Likudnik version of the Manchurian candidate, Newt has spent much of his post-Congress life in warrior colonies like the American Enterprise Institute, the think tank where he was a senior fellow two months after he stepped down as speaker in 1999 until he declared for president last May.

Gingrich also became a distinguished visiting fellow at Stanford's Hoover Institute. He was one of eight Hoover fellows to serve on the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board, the official war incubator chaired by ringleader Richard Perle, and he also signed on as a board member of the AEI-tied Committee for the Liberation of Iraq, a front group recruited by the White House.

As early as October 15, 2001, four days before the Afghanistan ground war began, Gingrich was already writing that "defeating the Taleban (sic) without defeating Saddam is like defeating imperial Japan and leaving the Nazis alone." That November, he helped lay the WMD groundwork for an Iraq invasion, claiming he'd personally talked to a defector who'd headed the Iraq nuclear program and that this unimpeachable source told him "there were 7,000 people working on nuclear weapons in Iraq." Gingrich concluded that "any reasonable person would have to come to the conclusion" that Saddam "intends to use them the first chance he gets." In an hour-long 2003 interview with Charlie Rose, Gingrich offered an historical endorsement of pre-emptive war, describing it almost as an American habit, and said he was "fairly involved" in the Iraq attack, calling himself "the longest-serving teacher in the military" with "21 years of teaching brigadier and major generals" at the National War College. "I talk to people," he explained.

One of the people he was talking to was Ahmad Chalabi, the leader of the Iraqi National Congress, a Shiite exile group. Chalabi was a prized pro-Israel Muslim dedicated to the overthrow of Saddam. Gingrich even helped steer one 1998 Iraq liberation bill through Congress, awarding Chalabi's group up to \$97 million in American aid to orchestrate an overthrow.

What is most amazing about the national press corps is that we can have 19 debates and not hear a single memorable question about the war that is America's greatest international debacle since Vietnam, with no moderator even wondering if Newt's role as at least a junior planner schmoozing away at Centcom and in the AEI home office of its architects, merits questioning.

-- The Daily Beast, 31 Jan 12

The "birthers" are back

The birther movement is back, and its goal is trying to get President Obama knocked off the fall ballot in as many states as possible.

Orly Taitz, the naturalized-citizen birther provocateur from Moldavia, is trying to get Obama thrown off the Georgia state ballot. Her argument is, yet again, that Obama is allegedly not a natural-born citizen, according to the constitutional requirement.

Georgia state Judge Michael Malihi issued a subpoena for President Obama to defend himself against the Taitz suit. Obama's legal team ignored the subpoena, and the president went to Las Vegas to give a speech the day of the hearing, according to the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*.

During the evidentiary court proceedings last Thursday, Malihi chastised Taitz for pleading the case to the cameras in the courtroom, instead of to him.

The ballot eligibility hearing concluded with the decision ultimately being left to Georgia Republican Secretary of State Brian Kemp. Kemp ominously warned White House lawyers, "If you and your client [President Obama] choose to suspend your participation [in the hearing] ... please understand that you do so at your own peril."

Taitz, a California dentist, doesn't have a great record of success. In fact, a federal judge in the Peach State fined her \$20,000 last year for filing frivolous lawsuits challenging Obama's eligibility to be president.

-- Mark Karlin, <http://blog.buzzflash.com> Jan. 31, 2012

Conservatism Thrives on Low Intelligence and Poor Information

By George Monbiot

We [progressives] have been too polite to mention the Canadian study published last month in the journal *Psychological Science*, which revealed that people with conservative beliefs are

likely to be of low intelligence. It feels crude, illiberal to point out that the other side is, on average, more stupid than our own. But this, the study suggests, is not unfounded generalisation but empirical fact.

There is plenty of research showing that low general intelligence in childhood predicts greater prejudice towards people of different ethnicity or sexuality in adulthood. Open-mindedness, flexibility, trust in other people: all these require certain cognitive abilities. Understanding and accepting others – particularly "different" others – requires an enhanced capacity for abstract thinking.

The new study shows that prejudice tends not to arise directly from low intelligence but from the conservative ideologies to which people of low intelligence are drawn. Conservative ideology is the "critical pathway" from low intelligence to racism. Those with low cognitive abilities are attracted to "rightwing ideologies that promote coherence and order" and "emphasise the maintenance of the status quo".

This is not to suggest that all conservatives are stupid. There are some very clever people in government, advising politicians, running thinktanks and writing for newspapers, who have acquired power and influence by promoting rightwing ideologies.

But what we now see among their parties – however intelligent their guiding spirits may be – is the abandonment of any pretence of high-minded conservatism. On both sides of the Atlantic, conservative strategists have discovered that there is no pool so shallow that several million people won't drown in it. Whether they are promoting the idea that Barack Obama was not born in the US, that man-made climate change is an eco-fascist-communist-anarchist conspiracy, or that the deficit results from the greed of the poor, they now appeal to the basest, stupidest impulses, and find that it does them no harm in the polls.

Don't take my word for it. Listen to two former Republican ideologues, David Frum and Mike Lofgren. Frum warns that "conservatives have built a whole alternative knowledge system, with its own facts, its own history, its own laws of economics". The result is a "shift to ever more extreme, ever more fantasy-based ideology" which has "ominous real-world consequences for American society".

Lofgren complains that "the crackpot outliers of two decades ago have become the vital centre today". The Republican party, with its

"prevailing anti-intellectualism and hostility to science" is appealing to what he calls the "low-information voter", or the "misinformation voter". While most office holders probably don't believe the "reactionary and paranoid claptrap" they peddle, "they cynically feed the worst instincts of their fearful and angry low-information political base."

-- *The Guardian*, Feb. 12, 2012

Senior U.S. Officer exposes "truth and lies about Afghanistan"

A US army officer has accused the American military of painting a misleading picture of progress in the war in Afghanistan.

Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Davis broke ranks with the official portrayal of the Afghan war after he 'witnessed the absence of success on virtually every level.'

'How many more men must die in support of a mission that is not succeeding?' Colonel Davis asked in an article titled 'Truth, Lies and Afghanistan: How Military Leaders Have Let Us Down'.

'No one expects our leaders to always have a successful plan,' he said in the article. 'But we do expect — and the men who do the living, fighting and dying deserve — to have our leaders tell us the truth about what's going on.'

In the piece published online in the *Armed Forces Journal*, which Colonel Davis admitted may cost him his career, he says he believes it is his duty to speak out because he has access to classified material which prove a disparity between what has happened and what the public is told.

He said that if Americans were able to compare 'the public statements many of our leaders have made with classified data, this credibility gulf would be immediately observable.'

Colonel Davis, joined the army in 1985 and spent most of last year on his second deployment to Afghanistan working with the Army's Rapid Equipping Force, a job he says took him 'into every significant area where our soldiers engage the enemy.'

He says it was this experience in which he spoke to over 250 soldiers, which confirmed that what he 'saw bore no resemblance to rosy official statements by U.S. military leaders about conditions on the ground.'

The Pentagon says it disagrees Colonel Davis' account but has not suggested any disciplinary action.

'Lieutenant Colonel Davis is obviously entitled to his opinion,'

spokesman George Little said, adding that defence secretary Leon Panetta 'has very strong confidence in his commanders in Afghanistan, as they provide assessments of what is happening on the ground in the war.'

Colonel Davis has reportedly provided a full account of his findings in a classified report to several members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, senators and House members.

-- www.dailymail.co.uk 8 February 2012

Ed.: LtCol Davis blames "military leaders". But does not blame also lie with him and every U.S. soldier who fights without a declaration of war?

N.Y. Times, Law Professor, Justice Ginsburg Trash the Constitution

WASHINGTON — The Constitution has seen better days.

"The U.S. Constitution appears to be losing its appeal as a model for constitutional drafters," according to a new study by David S. Law of Washington University in St. Louis and Mila Versteeg of the University of Virginia.

"Among the world's democracies," Professors Law and Versteeg concluded, "constitutional similarity to the United States has clearly gone into free fall. Over the 1960s and 1970s, democratic constitutions as a whole became more similar to the U.S. Constitution, only to reverse course in the 1980s and 1990s."

"The turn of the twenty-first century, however, saw the beginning of a steep plunge that continues through the most recent years for which we have data, to the point that the constitutions of the world's democracies are, on average, less similar to the U.S. Constitution now than they were at the end of World War II."

There are lots of possible reasons. The United States Constitution is terse and old, and it guarantees relatively few rights. The commitment of some members of the Supreme Court to interpreting the Constitution according to its original meaning in the 18th century may send the signal that it is of little current use to, say, a new African nation. And the Constitution's waning influence may be part of a general decline in American power and prestige.

In an interview, Professor Law identified a central reason for the trend: the availability of newer, sexier and more powerful operating systems in the constitutional marketplace. "Nobody wants to copy Windows 3.1," he said.

In a television interview during a visit to Egypt last week, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg of the Supreme Court seemed to agree. "I would not look to the United States Constitution if I were drafting a constitution in the year 2012," she said. She recommended, instead, the South African Constitution, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms or the European Convention on Human Rights.

-- Adam Liptak, New York Times, Feb. 6, 2012

FBI Enlists Internet Café Owners to Spy on Customers

The US government has created the Communities Against Terrorism (CAT) program to enlist your friendly local businesses as spies for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

The CAT program, funded by the State and Local Anti-Terrorism Training program (SLATT) is described as a "tool to engage members of the local community in the fight against terrorism." Only registered businesses may access the program's flyers listing "potential indicators" of terrorist activity.

For example, for owners of internet cafes the government's flyer designates people as suspicious if they "always pay cash".

It is officially creepy to use a café hotspot to download "photos, maps or diagrams" of a stadium, metro rail stop, or any "populated locations." To be safe, confine your travel plans to the Alaskan tundra. And, should there be another terrorist attack, do *not* demonstrate any "preoccupation with press coverage" of the attack. Just move along—nothing to see here.

If you engage in "suspicious" activities listed on CAT flyers, businesses are encouraged to "gather information" about you, including "license plates, vehicle description, names used, languages spoken, ethnicity, etc." At least 25 CAT flyers, collected by Public Intelligence, are known to exist.

Those who are computerless can become surveillance targets, too, if they own guns or precious metals, store a seven-day supply of food, buy a flashlight, believe in conspiracies or

participate in peaceful demonstrations.

The government's paranoia would be laughable were it not for the potential consequences for citizens who find themselves in its crosshairs. Under the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act, the government may detain indefinitely any terrorism suspects—including U.S. citizens. And, since the government has created pretexts for arresting virtually anyone, no one is safe.

The consequences for public safety are no less grim. If the FBI cannot distinguish between legitimate computer use and credible evidence of terrorist activities, it cannot zero in on genuine threats.

-- www.boilingfrogspost.com/2012/02/06

Commentary: SLATT is a private police and data gathering/sharing organization who created the CAT. Follow the disclaimer at the bottom of their website to their parent organization, the Institute for Intergovernmental Research...note that both are private police state entities funded through US Justice Department grants. Our tax dollars funding private companies to get citizens to spy on citizens....Orwell and Huxley, take notes....you boys did not dream it would get this out of hand.

Running D.C.'s gun-owner gauntlet

By Emily Miller

Owning a gun in the District of Columbia can be dangerous, because the city's hastily drafted rules are putting the innocent in jeopardy.

To continue exercising the Second Amendment right to keep arms, individuals have to renew registration certificates every three years and be re-fingerprinted every six years. The citizen is responsible for the fees in each case.

The city council drafted these requirements after the Supreme Court smacked down D.C.'s handgun ban in the 2008 Heller decision.

Gun owners must resubmit their address, information on each firearm, and confirmation that they are complying with all aspects of the regulations. The MPD's registration

office lacks a modern database that can stay updated on the status of certification. That means gun owners who were never notified may inadvertently be breaking the law.

At a hearing Monday, Councilman Phil Mendelson proposed changing the law so that the re-registration process doesn't require taking the 20-question written test again.

Police Chief Cathy L. Lanier said MPD would need a new and expensive database system similar to that used to track drivers' licenses.
-- Washington Times, Jan. 31, 201

NYC: Gun charges dropped against tea party leader

Felony gun charges have been dropped against Tea Party Patriots co-founder Mark Meckler, who on Thursday agreed to plead guilty to a lesser charge of disorderly conduct and pay a fine.

Meckler in December was arrested at a New York City airport after attempting to check a locked gun box holding his Glock 27 pistol and ammunition with a Delta Air Lines ticket agent.

Authorities said he was arrested because, despite holding a concealed-carry permit for his pistol at home in California, he did not have the gun registered in New York where he was attempting to board the plane.

On his blog Thursday, Meckler called the episode "a horrible nightmare for my family."

He said authorities won't give him his gun back, calling that decision "government robbery."

"There is no law that allows them to confiscate a weapon in this manner," he said. "They simply say 'no' when you ask for your weapon back. This is apparently their 'policy.' It is done regularly in New York."

-- http://dailycaller.com/2012/01/12

When seconds count, police are just minutes away!

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375

Wake County, NC, Dave (919) 521-4147

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____